

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Leslie Wood,	:	Civil Action No.: _____
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Debt Management, Inc; and DOES 1-10, inclusive,	:	COMPLAINT
	:	
Defendant.	:	

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Leslie Wood, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of the Defendant's repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collections Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of the Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendant and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b), in that the Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. Plaintiff, Leslie Wood (hereafter "Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
5. Defendant, Debt Management, Inc., (hereafter "Defendant"), is a domestic corporation with an address of 249 South Street, Plainville, Massachusetts 02762 operating as a

collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

6. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by the Defendant and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

7. The Defendant at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

8. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation that was primarily for family, personal or household purposes, and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

9. Thereafter, the debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to the Defendant for collection from Plaintiff.

10. The Defendant then began attempts to collect this debt from the Plaintiff, which was a “communication” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

11. The Defendant’s Collectors were loud, abusive, and yelled at the Plaintiff when speaking to him over the phone.

12. The Defendant did not send the Plaintiff the required verification letter to validate the alleged debt.

13. The Defendant threatened to bring a lawsuit against the Plaintiff if the debt was not immediately paid. However, up until this point, the Defendant has not instituted any legal action against the Plaintiff.

14. The Defendant threatened to place a lien on the Plaintiff’s home if the debt was not paid.

15. The Defendant threatened to take the Plaintiff's car if the debt was not immediately paid.

16. The Defendant continued to contact the Plaintiff after the Plaintiff requested that the communications cease.

17. The Defendant called the Plaintiff without disclosing the name of the debt collection agency.

18. The Plaintiff has suffered actual damages as a result of these illegal collection communications in the form of humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration, embarrassment, amongst other negative emotions, as well as suffering from unjustified and abusive invasions of personal privacy at the Plaintiff's home and workplace.

COUNT I

VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*

19. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

20. The Defendant contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1).

21. The Defendant used abusive language when speaking with the consumer, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2).

22. The Defendant caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5).

23. The Defendant placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6).

24. The Defendant misrepresented the character, amount and legal status of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(2).

25. The Defendant threatened the Plaintiff with seizure of his property if the debt was not paid, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4).

26. The Defendant threatened the Plaintiff with attachment of his property if the debt was not paid, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4).

27. The Defendant threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5).

28. The Defendant employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10).

29. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

30. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the debt was owed, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2).

31. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the debt within thirty days, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3).

32. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4).

33. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5).

34. The Defendant continued collection efforts even though the debt had not been validated, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b).

35. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

COUNT II

VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,

M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, *et seq.*

37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

38. The Defendant employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

39. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 11 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

COUNT III

INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

40. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

41. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or [his] private

affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

42. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

43. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon the Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with frequent telephone calls, threatening the Plaintiff's property, and threatening legal action.

44. The telephone calls made by the Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to his existence," thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

45. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

46. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendant.

47. All acts of the Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendant:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendant;

2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against the Defendant;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against the Defendant;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from the Defendant for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
6. Punitive damages; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: November 11, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
Attorneys for Plaintiffs